

## Hovis, Jennifer

---

**From:** Hovis, Jennifer  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 23, 2015 10:44 AM  
**To:** CC Grisham  
**Subject:** RE: FOIA request EPA-HQ-2015-008475

Here are two sites that may help. The first describes the 3 mechanisms for listing sites – HRS is by far the majority, but each state also gets one pick for a high priority site (the third relates to health advisories, which has not been used to list any sites in Arkansas). The second link below gives the list of all sites listed via the state pick mechanism.

How sites are placed on the NPL:

[http://www.epa.gov/superfund/programs/npl\\_hrs/nplon.htm](http://www.epa.gov/superfund/programs/npl_hrs/nplon.htm)

The list of sites placed on the NPL based on the 'state pick':

<http://www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/query/queryhtm/nplss.htm>

=====

### Jennifer Hovis

Chief, Information Management Branch  
Office of Superfund Remediation & Technology Innovation (OSRTI)  
703.603.8888 / hovis.jennifer@epa.gov

---

**From:** CC Grisham [mailto: ]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 23, 2015 10:30 AM  
**To:** Hovis, Jennifer  
**Subject:** Re: FOIA request EPA-HQ-2015-008475

Yes please, I would appreciate that. Thank you.

On Jul 23, 2015, at 07:00, Hovis, Jennifer <[Hovis.Jennifer@epa.gov](mailto:Hovis.Jennifer@epa.gov)> wrote:

I saw in the attachments to this request that you included a previous email dialogue with Region 6 that asked a question about the HRS score for the Cedar Chemical site. In the event they did not address that question for you, I wanted to let you know that site was listed to the NPL as a result of the 'state pick' mechanism, rather than HRS scoring. If you are not familiar with the 3 mechanisms for listing, I can provide a few links for you. Just let me know.

---

**From:** CC Grisham [mailto: ]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 22, 2015 11:14 AM  
**To:** Hovis, Jennifer  
**Subject:** Re: FOIA request EPA-HQ-2015-008475

Sure:

On Jul 22, 2015, at 04:52, Hovis, Jennifer <[Hovis.Jennifer@epa.gov](mailto:Hovis.Jennifer@epa.gov)> wrote:

I will speak with them to clear that up.

Do you have a number we can call you at directly on Thursday, or shall I distribute a conference line?

---

**From:** CC Grisham [<mailto:> ]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 21, 2015 5:36 PM  
**To:** Hovis, Jennifer  
**Cc:** Ford, Mark; Lane, Leticia  
**Subject:** Re: FOIA request EPA-HQ-2015-008475

Ms Hovis:

3:00 eastern time is fine. Ok for extension, I agree. I need to know the estimated cost before you spend any more time. Region 6 never charges me, I don't even have to request a waiver. If I have to pay for this, I would like to withdraw and resubmit, as I didn't request a waiver and feel I definitely qualify, and last time had to pay HQ for a response. Please speak to Mark Ford and Leticia Lane in Region 6 about how my request can be considered in the "other" category, as they do, in order that I not be charged. My inquiries are in the public's best interest. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Charles Grisham Jr

On Jul 21, 2015, at 14:03, Hovis, Jennifer <[Hovis.Jennifer@epa.gov](mailto:Hovis.Jennifer@epa.gov)> wrote:

<image001.gif>  
Mr. Grisham,

I would like to see if we could arrange a time to talk on **Thursday, July 23** regarding this FOIA. I understand you were able to speak with Chip Love yesterday after not reaching me. We'd like to talk a bit more about the request and make sure we're honing in on what you are interested in. We will also need to request an extension for our response, as we do not anticipate being able to meet the assigned deadline of July 29.

We are available at Noon, 2pm or 3pm (all Eastern) on Thursday. Please let me know if any of those work for you.

Thank you,

Jennifer Hovis